

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 4-7 and 10-14 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Stevens et al. (U.S. published application 2005/0083213). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By way of the present amendment, Applicant have added the limitations of claims 2 and 3 to claim 1 and the limitations of claims 8 and 9 to claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection is now overcome since claims 3 and 9 were not rejected under this grounds.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-5 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Stevens et al. in view of Davis et al. (U.S. Patent 4,786,902). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By way of the present amendment, Applicants have cancelled claims 3 and 9 thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot. However, since these limitations were added to claims 1 and 7, this rejection will be considered in regard to those amended claims.

The Examiner points out that the Stevens reference shows an electronic tag body connected to a reader in wireless fashion and the display module connected to the tag body to read and display the signals. The Examiner states that the tag body includes an antenna, radio frequency module, baseband controller, memory controller and a memory. The Examiner feels that it is inherent that the processor can operate

as a baseband controller, memory controller and display controller. The Examiner admits that Stevens does not teach the use of a display interface between a display controller and a display panel. The Examiner relies on Davis to teach a display interface within a controller and panel.

Applicants submit that amended claims 1 and 7 are not obvious over this combination of references. First, the Examiner has stated that Stevens teaches that the tag body receives signals from the reader and stores the signals. Applicants have reviewed the teachings of Stevens, including the indicated paragraphs and believe the Examiner has misinterpreted the reference. As indicated in the last two sentences of paragraph 30, the memory stores a unique identification number which may be permanent. This can only be changed with a special program and transmitter. The remainder of the reference does not discuss storing any information in this memory. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner is incorrect in stating that the tag body receives signals from the reader and stores the signals. Applicants have further emphasized this difference by now pointing out that the display module reads and displays the stored signal. Applicants submit that neither of the references teach this arrangement.

Further, Applicants submit that Stevens does not teach the five elements described as part of the tag body. Figure 4 of Stevens does disclose an antenna 360 and a memory 330. However, the reference does not show a radio frequency module, a baseband controller or a memory controller. The Examiner feels that it is inherent that processor 320 can operate as the three controllers. However, Applicants see no statement to this effect in the Stevens reference. Furthermore, it is noted that the baseband controller is described as being connected to the radio frequency module. Even assuming that transceiver 350 corresponds to a radio frequency module, it still would not be connected to processor 320, but instead is connected to memory device 330. Further, it is noted that the memory controller is described as being connected to the baseband controller. There is also no description of this in the Stevens reference.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that these features are also not shown in Stevens.

The Examiner has also admitted that Stevens does not show the display interface between the controller and panel. Applicants submit that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the two devices to meet the terms of the claims and especially the features described above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 7 is another independent claim which is similar to claim 1 but further describes the reader. Applicants submit that claim 7 is also allowable for the same reasons recited above in regard to claim 1.

Claims 4-6 and 10-14 depend from these allowable claims and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features that make these claims additionally allowable.

Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Stevens et al. in view of Davis et al. and further in view of Giering et al. (U.S. Published application 2005/0161501). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies on Giering et al. to show a display panel made of electronic paper or LCD. Even if this reference does show these features, Applicants submit that these claims remain allowable based on their dependency from allowable independent claims.

CONCLUSION


In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants hereby petition for an extension of two (2) months to January 24, 2006 in which to file a reply to the Office Action. The required fee of \$450.00 is enclosed herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joe McKinney Muncy
Registration No.: 32,334
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant